

Remarks

This Amendment and Response is considered fully responsive to the 29 October 2008 Office Action. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 were pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 stand rejected in the 29 October 2008 Office Action. In the following Response, claims 1, 27, and 50 are amended without prejudice merely to clarify a claim term to be consistent with its use in the specification. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0047] of the published application. Claim 18 has also been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments. Claims 1-7, 12-33, and 38-52 are now pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel

The non-final Office Action has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 12-14, 22-25, 27-29, 32, 38, 39, 45-48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,099,301 to Hueymin Sheu (hereinafter “Sheu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,102,970 to Paul Kneipp (hereinafter “Kneipp”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,197,640 to William S. Meisel (hereinafter “Meisel”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1, 27, and 50 have been amended to clarify the terminology of the claims and not for any reason related to the patentability of the claims. Specifically, claims 1, 27, and 50 have been amended to clarify that the recited “alphanumeric termination *cause code*” *indicates a reason the communication was disconnected*. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the originally filed application. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0047] of the published application. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner admits that the Sheu reference fails to teach the following: (1) recording an alphanumeric such a termination cause code; (2) translating the alphanumeric termination cause code into a numeric termination cause code; and (3) wherein translating the alphanumeric termination cause code is performed by an enterprise gatekeeper. *See* page 2 of the Office action.

The Examiner, however, argues that the “alphanumeric termination code” of Kneipp teaches the recited “alphanumeric termination *cause code*.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kneipp discloses an alphanumeric termination code that is entered by an agent in response to the end of a particular call. *See, e.g.*, column 4, lines 37-47. Examples of the termination codes contemplated by Kneipp include a “no answer” or “yes sale.” *See Figure 6A*. This entry of “termination code” as used in Kneipp does not teach or suggest a termination *cause* code as recited in independent claims 1, 27, and 50; from which the remaining rejected claims depend.

In order to clarify the claims, Applicant has also amended the claims to recite that the alphanumeric termination *cause* code *indicates a reason the communication was disconnected*. As discussed in the specification of the present application, such a termination *cause* code (as opposed to the termination code entered by an agent in Kneipp) can be used to perform diagnostics on the network and for generating billing information, such as being used to filter calls which should not be billed from a set of total calls. *See, e.g.*, paragraph [0048] of the published application.

None of the Sheu, Kneipp, or Meisel references teach or suggest at least such an alphanumeric termination *cause* code that *indicates a reason the communication was disconnected*. Thus, claims 1, 27, and 50 as well as claims 2-7, 12-33 and 38-49 that depend from claims 1, 27, and 50 are not obvious over Sheu in view of Kneipp and in further view of Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-50 and allow claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-50.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and Galloway

The non-final Office Action has rejected claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,430,709 to James R. Galloway (hereinafter “Galloway”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31, and 33 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Galloway fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31 and 33 and allow claims 4, 5, 7, 30, 31 and 33.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and Kwan

The non-final Office Action has rejected claims 15 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0255154 to Kwan et al. (hereinafter “Kwan”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 15 and 40 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Galloway fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 15 and 40 and allow claims 15 and 40.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Justice and Kwan

The non-final Office Action has rejected claims 16 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,056 to Justice et al. (hereinafter “Justice”) and further in view of Kwan. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 16 and 41 depend from claims 51 and 52 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed below with respect to claims 51 and 52. Further, Applicant believes that Justice fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu and Kwan. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 16 and 41 and allow claims 16 and 41.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Justice

The non-final Office Action has rejected claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Justice. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner alleges that the Sheu reference teaches creating “an authentication record” based upon a statement that “user-related credit information” is updated. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The mere updating of credit information fails to teach or suggest the authentication record recited in independent claims 51 and 52.

In the event that the Examiner disagrees, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner direct Applicant to the specific disclosure of Sheu and Justice that support the allegations with respect to these limitations.

The Examiner also ignores the limitation of independent claims 51 and 52 of “parsing the information associated with the communication” to create the recited authentication record. Again Sheu fails to teach or disclose at least these limitations recited in independent claims 51 and 52. Nor does Applicant believe that Justice overcomes at least these deficiencies of Sheu. Thus, Applicant believes that independent claims 51 and 52, as well as claims 17, 20, 21, and 44 that depend from claims 51 and 52, are not obvious over Sheu in view of Justice. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requestst that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 and allow claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp, Meisel, Kwan and Justice

The non-final Office Action has rejected claims 18, 19, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and Kwan as applied to claims 15 and 40 above, and further in view of Justice. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 18, 19, 42, and 43 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Kwan fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18, 19, 42, and 43 and allow claims 18, 19, 42, and 43.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp, and Meisel and Devine

The non-final Office Action has rejected claims 26 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,376 to Devine et al. (hereinafter “Devine”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 26 and 49 depend from claims 1 and 27 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 27. Further, Applicant believes that Devine fails to overcome at least the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Sheu, Kneipp, and Meisel. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 26 and 49 and allow claims 26 and 49.

Extension of Time

Applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension of time and is submitting the accompanying fee herewith. Applicant believes no other fee or petition is necessary with this Amendment and Response. Should any other fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 as necessary.

Conclusion

Claims 1-7, 12-33, and 38-52 are currently pending in the application. Applicants have fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the non-final Office Action dated 29 October 2008 and believes that claims 1-7, 12-33, and 38-52 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 2, 2009



Thomas J. Osborne, Jr., Reg. No. 39,796
USPTO Customer No. 69693

HENSLEY KIM & HOLZER, LLC
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3050
Denver, Colorado 80264
Tel: 720-377-0709
Fax: 720-377-0777

TJO/sbm